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Glossary

Detachment-limited conditions A condition under which the rate of erosion by overland or open-channel flow is related to a detachment rate and no deposition occurs.

Explicit numerical methods Numerical methods in which the value of the quantity being solved for is calculated using variables of the system evaluated at the previous time step only.

Implicit numerical methods Numerical methods in which the value of the quantity being solved for is calculated using variables of the system evaluated at both the current and previous time steps.

Newton’s method An iterative method for finding successively better approximations to the solution of a general (e.g., nonlinear) function, using the value of that function and its derivative.

Soil production function A function that quantifies the relationship between the rate of bedrock conversion into regolith/soil and the thickness of soil at that point on the landscape.

Transport-limited conditions A condition under which the rate of erosion or deposition is related to the gradient (in two dimensional (2D)) or divergence (in 3D) of the unit sediment flux.

Abstract

Numerical modeling has become an important method for studying landscape evolution, complementing field- and lab-based techniques such as geologic mapping and geochronology. This chapter describes several techniques used to discretize and solve the most fundamental partial differential equations that arise in landscape evolution. Although landscape evolution modeling encompasses all process zones (hillslope, fluvial, aeolian, glacial, and coastal), this chapter draws primarily from examples in hillslope and fluvial systems. The numerical techniques useful for simulating transport- and detachment-limited landscapes, including alternating direction implicit and upwind differencing methods, as well as root-finding techniques such as Newton’s method that are useful for solving nonlinear equations, are emphasized. The chapter also reviews some of the challenges associated with sub-grid-scale processes (e.g., modeling erosion in channels that are not resolved in cross section) and combining different types of processes within numerical models.

2.3.1 Fundamental Processes and Equations

Landscapes evolve in response to tectonic uplift, the weathering of bedrock into regolith, and the transport of sediment by the shear forces of liquid water, wind, and ice. This introductory section describes some of the key processes and equations of hillslope and fluvial geomorphology. Subsequent sections describe specific methods for solving each type of equation. Although this chapter focuses on hillslope and fluvial processes, many of the techniques are suitable for modeling other process types.

2.3.1.1 Conservation of Mass and Overland/Open-Channel Flow

Perhaps the most fundamental equation in landscape evolution is conservation of mass:

$$\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot q$$  \[1\]
where \( z \) is the local height or thickness of some quantity, \( t \) the time, and \( q \) the unit volumetric flux (i.e., the volumetric flux per unit width of flow, expressed in units of \( \text{length}^2 \text{time}^{-1} \)). Equation [1] states that the rate of increase or decrease in some conserved quantity (e.g., depth of water or thickness of sediment) is equal to the negative of the divergence of the volumetric unit flux of that quantity. Equation [1] must be combined with an equation that relates the flux of the conserved quantity to its controlling variables (e.g., flow depth, slope, and bed drag). Flux equations in geomorphology are almost always empirically based, owing to the difficulty of quantifying the turbulent flow of water and sediment in Earth’s near-surface environment. For example, the velocity of water in overland or open-channel flow is often assumed to be a function of the hydraulic radius \( R \), the water-surface slope \( S \), and an empirical coefficient, \( n \), used to quantify the drag exerted on the flow by the bed. Manning’s equation is one such relationship: 

\[
v = \frac{R^{2/3}S^{1/2}}{n}
\]  

[2]

Equations [1] (modified so that \( h \), not \( z \), is the thickness of the conserved quantity) and [2] can be combined to form a single equation for the flow depth \( h \), assuming that the hydraulic radius can be approximated by the flow depth:

\[
\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{h^{5/3} |\nabla z + \nabla h|^{1/2}}{n} \right)
\]  

[3]

where \( z \) is the bed elevation and \( \vec{s} \) the unit vector in the direction of the slope aspect. Equation [3] can be solved for the flow depth, \( h_{i,j} \), at every pixel of a raster grid by discretizing the flux term as

\[
d_{i,j+1/2} = \frac{(h_{i+1,j} + h_{i,j+1})^{5/3}}{\Delta x (n_{i+1,j} + n_{i,j})} |z_{i+1,j} - z_{i,j} + h_{i+1,j} - h_{i,j}|^{1/2} \\
\times \text{sgn}(z_{i+1,j} - z_{i,j} + h_{i+1,j} - h_{i,j})
\]  

[4]

for the \( x \) component, where \( \Delta x \) is the pixel width in the \( x \) direction, and

\[
d_{i,j+1/2} = \frac{(h_{i,j+1} + h_{i,j})^{5/3}}{\Delta y (n_{i,j+1} + n_{i,j-1})} |z_{i,j+1} - z_{i,j} + h_{i,j+1} - h_{i,j}|^{1/2} \\
\times \text{sgn}(z_{i,j+1} - z_{i,j} + h_{i,j+1} - h_{i,j})
\]  

[5]

for the \( y \) component, where \( \Delta y \) is the pixel width in the \( y \) direction. On the right side of Equations [4] and [5], all of the variables refer to values of flow depth, elevation, and roughness at a pixel indexed by \((i,j)\) and their immediate neighbors in the \( x \) and \( y \) directions. On the left-hand side, the values of flux are indexed at half grid points. This type of indexing is required because fluxes are not defined at a grid point but rather as the material flowing between two grid points. The sums of flow depth and roughness in the numerator and denominator, respectively, appear because the flow depth needed for the calculation of flux is the average of the flow depth between two grid points associated with the flux, not the value at either grid point. The discretization of conservation of mass is given by

\[
h_{i,j}(t + \Delta t) = h_{i,j}(t) - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \left( d_{i+1/2,j} - d_{i-1/2,j} \right) \\
\frac{\Delta t}{\Delta y} \left( d_{i,j+1/2} - d_{i,j-1/2} \right)
\]  

[6]

Source (e.g., rainfall) and sink (e.g., infiltration) terms can be added to Equations [5] and [6] depending on the application. Equation [6] is an explicit method; alternative approaches are discussed in the Section 2.3.2.

As a simplification, many landform evolution models use contributing area or unit contributing area (i.e., the contributing area per unit width of flow) as a proxy for discharge or unit discharge, respectively. Contributing area is calculated using one of several raster-based flow-routing methods. The three most commonly used flow-routing methods are D8 (O’Callaghan and Mark, 1984), multiple flow direction (MFD) (Freeman, 1991; Quinn et al., 1991), and D∞ (Tarboton, 1997). The D8 method routes flow from each pixel toward the neighboring pixel (including diagonals) that represents the steepest descent. D8 has the widely recognized problem that flow pathways are unrealistically restricted to multiples of 45°. The MFD and D∞ methods were designed to avoid this problem, that is, they provide more flexibility by allowing flow to be partitioned among multiple downslope neighbors. The MFD method works by partitioning flow between each pixel and its downslope neighboring pixels by an amount related to the slope in the direction of each downslope neighbor. The D∞ method partitions flow between two adjacent neighboring pixels whose triangular facet (formed by intersection with the center pixel) represents the steepest descent. The MFD method works best in divergent topography while the D∞ method works best in planar or convergent topography based on benchmark calculations of drainage in idealized topography (Tarboton, 1997). Care must be taken when using these methods to compute unit contributing area in order to minimize grid-resolution effects. This point is further addressed later in the chapter.

### 2.3.1.2 Soil Production and Colluvial Transport on Hillslopes

The rate-limiting process of landscape erosion is the weathering of bedrock into regolith and the transport of that regolith from hillslopes and into channels. Upland (soil over bedrock) hillslopes are comprised of a system of two interacting surfaces: the topographic surface, with elevations given by \( z \), and the underlying weathering front, given by \( b \) (Figure 1). The difference between these two surfaces is the soil or regolith thickness, denoted as \( h \) in this section. The topographic and weathering-front surfaces are strongly coupled because the shape of the topography controls erosion and deposition, which, in turn, controls the values of \( h \) (Furbish and Fagherazzi, 2001). The values of \( h \), in turn, control bedrock weathering/soil production rates. This two-way feedback can be quantified as

\[
z = b + h
\]  

[7]
Figure 1  (a) Schematic diagram of a hillslope profile from divide to channel head. (b) Models for the relationship between soil production rate and soil thickness, illustrating the exponential model of Heimsath, A.M., Dietrich, W.E., Nishiizumi, K., Finkel, R.C., 1997. The soil production function and landscape equilibrium. Nature 388, 358–361, with permission from Nature, and an alternative humped model based upon a particular form of the function proposed by Furbish, D.J., Fagherazzi, S., 2001. Stability of creeping soil and implications for hillslope evolution. Water Resources Research 37, 2607–2618, with permission from AGU.

\[
\frac{\partial b}{\partial t} = U - \frac{P}{\cos \theta} \tag{8}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = \rho_b \frac{P}{\rho_s \cos \theta} - E \tag{9}
\]

where \( \rho_b \) is the bedrock density, \( \rho_s \) the bulk sediment density, \( P \) the rate of bedrock recession normal to the surface, \( \theta \) the slope angle, \( U \) the rock uplift rate, and \( E \) the erosion rate (Heimsath et al., 1997, 2001). Cosmogenic radionuclide studies indicate that the rate of bedrock recession or weathering normal to the surface decays exponentially with the thickness of overlying regolith measured normal to the surface, \( h \cos \theta \):

\[
P = P_0 e^{-h \cos \theta / h_0} \tag{10}
\]

where \( P_0 \) is the bare-bedrock recession rate and \( h_0 \) a constant equal to approximately 0.5 m based on cosmogenic radionuclide studies.

Equation [10] states that bedrock lowering is a maximum for bare-bedrock hillslopes and decreases exponentially with increasing regolith thickness. Conceptually, the exponential relationship is a consequence of the buffering effect that regolith has on underlying bedrock, protecting it from diurnal temperature changes and the infiltrating runoff that drive physical and chemical weathering. The exponential soil production function may not capture the full complexity of soil production, however. As soil thickness decreases below a critical value, the landscape may be unable to store enough water to promote weathering or support plant life. Plants act as weathering agents (e.g., root growth can fracture rock and canopy cover can decrease evaporation). As such, in some arid and semi-arid environments, weathering rates may increase with increasing soil thickness for thin soils, activities inconsistent with the exponential model.

As such, a humped or bell-shaped relationship of soil production to soil thickness (Figure 1(b)) may be more accurate than an exponential relationship (e.g., Ahnert, 1977; Cox, 1980). Recent cosmogenic radionuclide data from granitic landscapes in Australia provide preliminary support for a humped production model (Heimsath et al., 2005).

Erosion on hillslopes occurs by colluvial (e.g., creep and bioturbation) processes and flowing water (e.g., slope/rill wash). The relative importance of these processes varies with distance from the divide, with colluvial processes dominating portions of hillslopes close to divides and slope/rill wash becoming more important near the valley head. The simplest model for erosion by colluvial processes is the diffusion model, first proposed by Culling (1960, 1963). The applicability of the diffusion equation has two requirements: (1) the unit sediment flux must be proportional to slope, that is,

\[
q = -\kappa \nabla z \tag{11}
\]

where \( \kappa \) is the diffusivity (units of length\(^2\) time\(^{-1}\)), and (2) conservation of mass. Combining Equations [11] and [9] yields the diffusion equation:

\[
\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = \kappa \nabla^2 z \tag{12}
\]

The erosion rate \( E \), as defined in Equation [9], is equal to the negative of the value calculated in Equation [12], that is, erosion is defined to be positive if the change in land surface elevation is negative.

To get a better sense for how erosion/deposition is related to topographic curvature on soil-mantled hillslopes, consider a small segment of a hillslope profile (e.g., the section between \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) in Figure 2). If more sediment enters the segment from upslope rather than leaving the segment downslope, the hillslope segment must store the difference, resulting in an increase in the average elevation. Conversely, if more sediment leaves the segment downslope rather than entering the segment upslope (as in the section between \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \)), there is
a net loss of sediment and the elevation must decrease. **Figure 2(a)** illustrates a hypothetical fault scarp 2-m high and 10-m wide after some erosion has taken place. **Figures 2(b) and 2(c)** illustrate the gradient and curvature of the scarp, respectively. The diffusion equation states that the sediment flux $q$ at any point along a hillslope is proportional to the local slope, and the resulting raising or lowering rate of the surface is proportional to the change in flux per unit length, which, in turn, is proportional to the curvature. **(d)–(f)** Graphs of elevation, slope, and curvature for 5 times following scarp offset ($kt = 0.25, 0.8, 2.5, 8$, and $25 m^2$). Modified with permission from Pelletier, J.D., 2008. Quantitative Modeling of Earth Surface Processes. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Evidence suggests that the diffusion model of hillslope evolution has limited applicability (e.g., Roering et al., 1999; Gabet, 2000; Heimsath et al., 2005). In steep landscapes, the rate of colluvial transport increases nonlinearly with slope as the angle of stability is approached:

$$q = -\frac{\kappa \nabla z}{1 - (|\nabla z|/S_c)^2}$$

where $S_c$ is the gradient of hillslope stability. Steep, planar hillslopes and abrupt, knife-edge drainage divides are a signature of landslide-dominated, nonlinear transport on hillslopes (Roering et al., 1999, 2001; Roering, 2004). In addition to the nonlinear slope dependence of hillslope transport processes, there is abundant evidence that rates of colluvial transport depend on the soil thickness. Equations [9] and [11] predict that sediment flux increases abruptly from zero to a finite value as the soil thickness goes from zero to finite. A more realistic approach assumes that sediment flux is
proportional to the soil thickness normal to the slope, at least for relatively thin soils (e.g., less than a couple of meters):

\[
q = -\frac{k h_n \nabla z}{1 - (\nabla z/S_c)^2}
\]  

[14]

where \( \kappa \) now has units of length time\(^{-1} \) and \( h_n \) is the soil thickness normal to the hillslope (Roering, 2008).

### 2.3.1.3 Erosion and Deposition by Overland and Open-Channel Flow

Erosion and deposition by overland and open-channel flow can be subdivided into transport-limited (TL) and detachment-limited (DL) conditions. Under TL conditions, the rate of erosion/deposition is related to the gradient (in two dimensional (2D)) or the divergence (in 3D) of the unit sediment flux, as in Equation [1]. In DL conditions, the erosion rate is equal to a detachment rate and no deposition occurs. In alluvial channels, TL conditions often predominate because sediment entrained from the channel bed is usually subject to redeposition further downchannel if the transport capacity of the channel decreases via a decrease in flow depth and/or slope. DL conditions may be a good approximation for the erosion of silt-dominated regolith on a hillslope that is subject to sealing/crusting, because, in such cases, most of the regolith may be transported as wash load once it is detached.

It should be noted that TL conditions for regolith erosion on hillslopes and in low-order valleys have been defined in two different ways in the literature. Both definitions assume that sediment transport occurs as bed-material load and that conservation of mass (Equation [1]) applies. Howard (1994a) employed a strict definition in which TL conditions apply only if the actual sediment flux equals the potential sediment flux, that is, the sediment load expected for a cohesionless substrate with no vegetation. If one adopts the above definition, many empirical equations exist that can be used to model the transport of cohesionless sediment grains by overland/open-channel flow. For example, the sediment transport equation of Wiberg and Smith (1989) computes the dimensionless unit sediment flux as a function of the Shields stress, \( \tau_w \):

\[
q_s = 9.64 \tau_w (\tau_w - \tau_{cr})^{3/2} \hat{s}
\]

[15]

where \( \tau_w \) is the Shields stress and \( \tau_{cr} \) the critical Shields stress, a parameter that is not constant but varies only slightly as functions of grain size and flow conditions around a representative value of 0.05. The Shields stress is defined, for steady flow conditions, as

\[
\tau_w = \frac{h S}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{\rho_s} - \frac{1}{\rho_w}} D}
\]

[16]

where \( h \) is the flow depth, \( S \) the local slope gradient, \( \rho_s \) the density of sediment grains, \( \rho_w \) the density of water, and \( D \) the mean grain diameter. The unit sediment flux is related to the dimensionless unit sediment flux as

\[
q = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\rho_s} - \frac{1}{\rho_w}} g D q_s.
\]

[17]

Equations [15]–[17] (and similar empirical equations for bedload transport analogous to Equation [15]) can be used to calculate the unit sediment flux by flowing water under steady flow conditions. By combining Equation [17] with conservation of mass (Equation [1]), the evolution of an alluvial channel bed can be modeled over the course of one or more flood events. Adopting the strict definition for TL conditions, that is, that the actual sediment flux equals the potential sediment flux, Howard (1994a) concluded that "erosion by overland flow and ephemeral filling on steep, vegetated slopes is nearly always detachment limited owing to the protection offered by the leaves, stems, and roots ... rills and steep washes on badland slopes are generally also detachment-limited owing to the shale or regolith cohesion." Vegetation cover and soil cohesion certainly control a landscape’s resistance to fluvial and slope-wash erosion but, whether or not sediment, once detached, is transported primarily as wash load or bed-material load, and hence, whether DL or TL conditions apply, is a separate issue from whether the actual sediment flux equals the potential sediment flux. A less strict definition of TL conditions assumes that sediment flux is proportional to a power function of drainage area (a proxy for discharge) and slope, minus an entrainment threshold, that is,

\[
q = k(A^m S^n - \theta_t) \hat{s} \quad \text{if} \quad A^m S^n > \theta_t
\]

\[
= 0 \quad \text{if} \quad A^m S^n \leq \theta_t
\]

[18]

where \( k \) is a transport coefficient dependent on climate, grain size, and substrate erodibility, \( m \) and \( n \) the dimensionless coefficients, \( \theta_t \) an entrainment threshold below which no transport takes place, and \( \hat{s} \) the unit vector in the direction of the slope aspect. Whether erosion or deposition occurs locally depends on the sign of the divergence of the unit sediment flux.

DL landscape evolution models assume that the rate of fluvial or slope-wash erosion of regolith is proportional to a power function of drainage area and along-channel slope, minus a detachment threshold, that is, the stream-power mode

\[
\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = -K(A^m S^n - \theta_{td}) \quad \text{if} \quad A^m S^n > \theta_{td}
\]

\[
= 0 \quad \text{if} \quad A^m S^n \leq \theta_{td}
\]

[19]

where \( K \) is an erodibility coefficient dependent on climate and substrate erodibility, \( m \) and \( n \) the dimensionless coefficients, and \( \theta_{td} \) the detachment threshold below which no erosion takes place (Howard, 1994b). In order for Equation [1] to apply, sediment, once detached, must be transported out of the domain in which DL conditions apply without deposition, that is, sediment must be transported primarily as wash load.

The landform evolution models of Smith and Bretherton (1972), Willgoose et al. (1991), Tarboton et al. (1992), Tucker and Bras (1998), Istanbulluoglu et al. (2003), and Simpson and Schlunegger (2003) treat regolith erosion as purely transport
limited, whereas those of Howard (1994b), Moglen and Bras (1995), and Perron et al. (2008, 2009) treat regolith erosion as purely detachment limited. As bed-material load and wash-load sediment transport occur in nearly all landscapes, TL and DL conditions are not mutually exclusive and, in fact, can be expected to occur concurrently in most landscapes. This fact has long been recognized by the soil erosion community (Smith et al., 2010) but, as indicated by the above references, it has been common in the literature on landscape evolution modeling to assume that either DL or TL conditions apply. Recent landscape evolution models of Willgoose (2005), Coulthard et al. (2007), and Wainwright et al. (2008a, 2008b, 2008c), however, do include both DL and TL conditions via a grain-size-dependent approach based on transport distance.

2.3.2 Solution Methods

2.3.2.1 Methods for Diffusive Equations

To solve partial differential equations such as those described above numerically, we must discretize each equation in space and time. The diffusion equation, because of its simplicity, is a particularly useful example for discretization. A standard discretization of the 2D diffusion equation, assuming that \( \Delta x = \Delta y \) for simplicity, is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
&z_{i,j}^{n+1} = z_{i,j}^n + \frac{\kappa \Delta t}{4 \Delta x^2} \left[ z_{i+1,j}^n + z_{i-1,j}^n + z_{i,j+1}^n + z_{i,j-1}^n - 4z_{i,j}^n \right] \tag{20}
\end{align*}
\]

which is known as the forward time centered space (FTCS) method because the spatial derivatives (i.e., the curvature) are calculated using \((i, j)\) as the center point and because the values at the new time step, \(i + \Delta t\) (indexed as \(n + 1\)), are calculated using just the old values from time \(i\) (indexed as \(n\)).

The FTCS method is useful for solving the diffusion equation on small grids. This scheme is numerically stable provided that the time step is less than or equal to \((\Delta x)^2/(2\kappa)\). Equation [20] is also known as an explicit scheme because the value of each grid point is an explicit function of the grid-point values at the previous time step.

The FTCS method starts with a prescribed initial value for \(z_{i,j}\) everywhere on the grid. In addition to the initial condition, boundary conditions on the value of \(z\) or its first derivative must also be specified at boundaries of the grid. These boundary conditions may be constant or may vary as a function of time. Equation [20] is then applied to every grid point during each time step of the model. The boundary conditions are then applied (forcing the value of \(z\) on the boundaries to be equal to a prescribed value or a prescribed difference from their neighboring values, depending on whether the boundary conditions are fixed \(z\) or a fixed derivative of \(z\), respectively) during each time step once all of the interior points have been updated. Figure 3 illustrates the evolution of diffusive hillslopes responding to instantaneous base-level drop along a series of gullies, for several different times following base-level drop. These results were obtained with the FTCS method.

The FTCS method is generally not useful for large grids because very small step sizes must be taken in order to maintain stability. An alternative approach to FTCS is to write Equation [20] using the new values (those at time step \(n + 1\)) on the right-hand side of the equation:

\[
\begin{align*}
&z_{i,j}^{n+1} = z_{i,j}^n + \frac{\kappa \Delta t}{\Delta x^2} \left[ z_{i+1,j}^{n+1} + z_{i-1,j}^{n+1} + z_{i,j+1}^{n+1} + z_{i,j-1}^{n+1} - 4z_{i,j}^{n+1} \right] \tag{21}
\end{align*}
\]

which is a matrix equation in which the values of \(z\) at all points of the grid are updated simultaneously. Equation [21] is known as the backward Euler method. It is also called an implicit method because the values at the new time step appear on both sides of the equation. The order of the matrix in Equation [21] is equal to the number of grid points, hence solving Equation [21] typically requires inverting a very large matrix.

The accuracy of Equation [21] and its ease of use can both be improved using the Alternating direction implicit (ADI) method. In this method, the 2D problem of Equation [21] is divided into a series of 1D problems, that is, first all of the rows are solved for and then all of the columns:

\[
\begin{align*}
&z_{i,j}^{n+1/2} = z_{i,j}^n + \frac{\kappa \Delta t}{2 \Delta x^2} \left( z_{i+1,j}^{n+1/2} + z_{i-1,j}^{n+1/2} - 2z_{i,j}^{n+1/2} + z_{i,j+1}^{n+1/2} + z_{i,j-1}^{n+1/2} - 2z_{i,j}^{n+1/2} \right) \tag{22}
\end{align*}
\]

This approach has two advantages. First, it is centered in time (i.e., the curvature term on the right side of the equation is an average of the curvature values at the beginning and end of the time step); therefore, it is more accurate than the backward Euler method of Equation [21], which uses only the curvature from the end of the time step. Second, by breaking up the problem into a series of 1D diffusion problems (i.e., solving rows and columns along the \(x\) and then along \(y\) directions separately), the matrix that has to be solved is both smaller and has a simpler, tri-diagonal form.

Implicit methods are far more stable than explicit methods. In fact, the implicit method is stable for any time step. The accuracy of the solution, however, still depends on the time step. In practice, it is useful to run two versions of the same implicit simulation with time steps that differ by a factor of 2. The difference between the two solutions provides an estimate of the accuracy of the results for the larger time step. The ADI and FTCS methods are useful for many flux-conservative equations (i.e., those in which conservation of mass applies), not just diffusion.

2.3.2.2 Methods for Advective Equations

Solving stream-power or DL equations requires a fundamentally different approach than solving TL or diffusive equations. The stream-power model is an example of an advection equation, which in a simple but general form is given by

\[
\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = c \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \tag{23}
\]

where \(c\) is a coefficient that can be either constant or a function of space and/or time. Advection equations involve the lateral translation of some quantity. The coefficient \(c\) in
Equation [23] has units of length over time and represents the speed at which $z$ is advected laterally. In the context of landform evolution, the advection equation is used to model retreating landforms, including cliffs, banks, and bedrock-channel knickpoints. The stream-power model (Equation [19]) with $m_d = \frac{1}{2}$ and $n_d = 1$ and no detachment threshold, that is, $q z q t = C_0^1 A^{1/2}$, is simply an advection equation with spatially variable advection coefficient. Conceptually, the stream-power model says that the action of bedrock-channel incision can be quantified by advecting the topography upstream with a local rate proportional to the square root of contributing area.

The FTCS method is inherently unstable when applied to advection problems. However, upwind differencing provides a simple, useful numerical method for advection equations. As applied to Equation [24], upwind differencing means simply that the along-channel slope is always calculated in the direction of steepest descent. More generally, that is, in Equation [23] where $c$ varies in space and/or time, upwind differencing involves calculating the slope along the direction of transport, that is,

$$z_{i+1}^{n+1} = z_i^n + \Delta t \left( \frac{z_{i+1}^n - z_i^n}{\Delta x} \right)$$

where $x$ is the distance from the divide, is simply an advection equation with spatially variable advection coefficient. Conceptually, the stream-power model says that the action of bedrock-channel incision can be quantified by advecting the topography upstream with a local rate proportional to the square root of contributing area.

In the FTCS technique, the centered-space gradient is calculated by taking the difference between the value of the grid point to the left (i.e., at $i - 1$) and the value to the right (i.e., at $i + 1$) of the grid point being updated. This approach is prone to instability because it does not make use of the value at the grid point $i$ itself. As such, the difference $z_{i+1}^n - z_i^n$ can be small even if the value of $z_i^n$ is wildly different from the values on either side of it. In effect, the FTCS method creates two largely decoupled grids (one with even $i$ and the other with odd $i$) that drift apart from each other over time. In the upwind method, this problem is corrected by calculating gradients using only one adjacent point. If the flux of material is moving from left to right, then physically it makes sense that the value of $z_{i+1}^n$ should depend on $z_i^n$, not on $z_{i+1}^n$. Conversely, the flux of material is in the opposite direction, $z_{i+1}^n$ should depend on $z_{i+1}^n$. The upwind differencing method implements that approach.

**Figure 4(a)** illustrates the evolution of a knickpoint modeled with Equation [23] using the upwind differencing method. One drawback of the upwind differencing
initiates a wave of bedrock incision in which channel knickpoints propagate rapidly through the drainage basin. In this model, knickpoints reach the drainage headwaters after 25 Myr and the maximum elevation at that time is nearly 3 km. Following 25 Myr, the range slowly erodes to its base level.

2.3.2.3 Methods for Solving Nonlinear Equations

The introduction presented the fundamental equations for the generation and transport of regolith on hillslopes. The equation for the rate of change of regolith thickness, using the exponential soil production function and the diffusion model for hillslope evolution, is

\[ \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = \frac{\rho_b}{\rho_s} \frac{P_0}{k \cos \theta} e^{-h \cos \theta / h_0} + \kappa \nabla^2 z \]  \[ \tag{26} \]

One application of this model involves solving for the steady-state soil thickness given knowledge of the topography (e.g., from airborne Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data). Setting Equation [26] equal to zero and solving for \( h \) gives

\[ h = \frac{h_0}{\cos \theta} \ln \left( \frac{\rho_b}{\rho_s} \frac{P_0}{k \cos \theta} \frac{1}{\nabla^2 z} \right) \]  \[ \tag{27} \]

Alternatively, if one assumes that sediment flux is depth dependent, that is, that the flux is equal to the product of \( \kappa \), \( h \cos \theta \), and slope, then the resulting equation for the steady-state regolith thickness is

\[ f(h) = \frac{\rho_b}{\rho_s} \frac{P_0}{k \cos \theta} e^{-h \cos \theta / h_0} + \kappa h \cos \theta \nabla^2 z + \kappa \nabla(h \cos \theta) \cdot \nabla z = 0 \]  \[ \tag{28} \]

which cannot be solved algebraically. Newton’s method is a powerful technique for solving nonlinear equations such as this. Given an initial guess for the regolith thickness at a point on the grid (e.g., zero), a better approximation to the solution is given by

\[ h_{n+1} = h_n - \frac{f(h_n)}{f'(h_n)} \]  \[ \tag{29} \]

where \( h_n \) is the value of regolith thickness at iteration \( n \) in the Newton’s method. Figure 6 illustrates the steady-state soil thicknesses obtained by solving Equation [28] corresponding to a range of values of the nondimensional parameter \((\rho_b/\rho_s)p_0/k\) for a region in the Mojave Desert. These maps were produced using Newton’s method. The soil thickness at each value of the grid was solved in descending order of elevation, starting at the highest elevation (where there is no sediment flux from upslope) and moving downhill, using the values of \( h \) in the upslope directions in \( x \) and \( y \) in order to compute the gradient of \( h \) in Equation [28] corresponding to each trial value. Based on field measurements of soil thickness, the value \((\rho_b/\rho_s)p_0/k = 0.03\) provides reasonable predictions for soil thickness in this study area based on a comparison with available field data (not shown).
2.3.2.4 Combining Process Models and Minimizing Grid-Resolution Dependence

This section describes some of the challenges involved in combining process models and minimizing their grid-resolution dependence. In many models, multiple process types (e.g., diffusive and advective processes) coexist in many pixels. How to weigh the relative importance of each process type is often unclear, especially given that any model is necessarily an incomplete (i.e., subsampled) representation of the actual landscape being modeled.

Two alternative approaches have been taken to combining colluvial and fluvial/slope-wash processes in landscape evolution models. Howard (1994b) assumed that the value of $z$ in each pixel represents the average elevation, including both hillslope and channel/valley components. This approach requires the user to prescribe the relative importance of fluvial and hillslope processes in each pixel. Howard (1994b), for example, assumed that each pixel contains one and only one channel; hence, fluvial processes are assumed to act on a subset of the area of each pixel equal to $w/\delta$, where $w$ is a prescribed channel width and $\delta$ the pixel width. One problem with this approach is that the density of channels (a property of the natural landscape that must be independent of grid resolution) is forced to be inversely proportional to the pixel width, for example, the channel density doubles as the pixel size is halved. A second problem is that the derivative of $z$ in this approach is not equal to the slope of the fluvial pathway (as required by the stream-power model), but rather is the derivative of some average elevation that includes both hillslope and channel/valley components. An alternative approach advocated by Pelletier (2010) is to treat the value of $z$ in each pixel as the elevation of the dominant fluvial pathway in each pixel. The dominant fluvial pathway acts as the base level of erosion for all the sub-grid-scale topography within the area represented by that pixel. The topography within a grid point adjusts to the elevation of the dominant fluvial pathway; hence, it is only necessary to track the erosion of that point. This alternative approach does not require that the relative dominance of fluvial and colluvial processes in each pixel be prescribed, because only the erosion of the dominant fluvial pathway (which may be a channel, rill, or zone of sheetflow) in each pixel is being tracked by the model.

A third approach, used by Pelletier (2008), does not attempt to combine colluvial and fluvial/overland flow processes in individual pixels, but rather assumes that fluvial/overland flow is negligible on hillslopes and that colluvial processes are negligible in valleys. In this approach, a drainage density must be prescribed and only colluvial processes are applied to areas where the product of slope and the square root of contributing area are greater than a threshold value equal to the inverse of the drainage density, as observed empirically by Montgomery and Dietrich (1988). The drawback of this approach is twofold: (1) it introduces a new parameter into the model, the drainage density, which ultimately must be a function of other variables in the model (e.g., substrate erodibility $K$ and diffusivity $k$) and (2) it does not model the coexistence/competition between colluvial and slope-wash/fluvial processes in the vicinity of valley heads.

Figure 5  Model results for the stream-power model following 1-km uniform block uplift of an idealized mountain range. In the stream-power model, knickpoints rapidly propagate into the upland surface, limiting the peak elevation to $\approx 3$ km at 25 Myr following uplift.
To minimize the grid-resolution dependence of landform evolution models that quantify slope-wash and fluvial erosion/deposition using the contributing area, it is also necessary to make some modifications to the existing flow-routing algorithms. The contributing areas computed by existing flow-routing algorithms depend on grid resolution. To minimize this problem, it is necessary to formulate fluvial/slope-wash erosion and transport relationships in terms of the unit contributing area, that is, the contributing area per unit width of flow, rather than the contributing area. Landform evolution models in which fluvial erosion rates are assumed to be a power-law function of unit stream power, for example, should have the form

$$q_w = \frac{(\rho_s/\rho_d)}{C_{18}/C_{19}} \frac{U}{K} \frac{A_w}{C_{18}/C_{19} p_d S_n d}$$

if $A_w/C_{18}/C_{19} p_d S_n d > \theta_{ad}$

$$q_w = \frac{(\rho_s/\rho_d)}{C_{18}/C_{19}} \frac{U}{K} \frac{A_w}{C_{18}/C_{19} p_d S_n d}$$

if $A_w/C_{18}/C_{19} p_d S_n d \leq \theta_{ad}$

[30]

where $w$ is the width of flow in the dominant fluvial pathway within each pixel and $p_d$ a dimensionless coefficient. It should be noted that the units of $K$ and $\theta_c$ differ depending on the value of $p_d$. Equation [30] also includes a source term, $(\rho_s/\rho_d)U$. The form of that term implicitly assumes that regolith covers the landscape, that is, at the surface, all bedrock has been converted to soil prior to erosion.

In tributary valleys, it is generally a good approximation to assume that the width of the flow is proportional to a power function of the contributing area (a proxy for discharge), that is,

$$w_v = c A^b$$

[31]

where $b \approx 1/2$ and $c$ is a coefficient that varies between drainage basins (Leopold and Maddock, 1953). The $w$ in Equation [31] has a subscript $v$ to indicate that Equation [31] is used to calculate flow width on valleys only. Substituting Equation [31] into Equation [30] and subsuming the coefficient $c$ into $K$ and $\theta_c$ yield the familiar form of the stream-power erosion model for regolith-covered landscapes (Equation [19]) where $m_d = p_d - b$. If $p_d = 1$ and $b = 1/2$, for example, $m_d = 1/2$. The formulation based on $A/w$ (i.e., Equation [30]) is more fundamental than the formulation based on $A$ (i.e., Equation [19]) because Equation [30] does not require that the power-law relationship between contributing area and flow width (i.e., Equation [31]) applicable to tributary valleys applies throughout the landscape. On
hillslopes, the width of flow in each pixel is equal to the pixel width, that is, \( w_h = \delta \), if flow occurs as sheetflooding. Alternatively, if flow occurs in finely spaced parallel rills, the width of flow within the dominant fluvial pathway is equal to the flow in each rill, that is, \( w_h = (w_r/l_r)\delta \), where \( w_r \) is the width of flow in each rill and \( l_r \) is the rill spacing.

Figure 7(a) schematically compares the results of flow routing on digital elevation models (DEMs) representing planar and convergent hillslopes. On a planar hillslope, flow is routed in the direction of the slope aspect. The contributing area of each pixel at the slope base is, therefore, equal to \( L\delta \), where \( L \) is the length of the slope and \( \delta \) the pixel width. At the outlet of the convergent slope (the point to which all flow is routed in this hypothetical example), the contributing area is equal to \( L^2 \). As such, the contributing areas of pixels on planar hillslopes depend on pixel width, whereas the contributing areas of pixels in zones of strongly convergent flow (where all flow is focused into a pathway narrower than a pixel width) do not depend on pixel width. This problem is perhaps best illustrated using specific flow-routing methods in idealized topographic cases. Figures 7(c) and 7(d) illustrate the ratios of contributing area calculated by the MFD and \( D_\infty \) methods on a synthetic second-order drainage basin (illustrated in Figure 7(b)) with pixel width of \( \delta \) to the contributing area of the same drainage basin bilinearly interpolated to a pixel width of \( \delta/2 \) (shown here for \( \delta = 0.25 \) m). In this analysis, the contributing area computed on the interpolated grid is sub-sampled to the same resolution as the original grid, adopting the maximum value for contributing area within each pixel. The ratio of these two contributing area maps is then computed and denoted as \( f \). The unit contributing area, \( a \), is scale independent, the ratio of the contributing area calculated with pixel width \( \delta \) to the contributing area of the exact same DEM interpolated to a pixel width of \( \delta/2 \) and then sub-sampled back to the original pixel width should be 1 or nearly 1 everywhere on the landscape. The fact that this ratio differs significantly from 1 (i.e., it is close to 2 on most areas of the hillslope (as indicated by the mostly white area) and close to 1 in the pixels that comprise the tributary valley network) indicates that the MFD and \( D_\infty \) methods are scale dependent when it comes to computing the maximum value of contributing area across different scales of model resolution. This is a general problem for any value of \( \delta \) and for any landscape that includes hillslopes of variable convergence and/or both hillslopes and valleys.

One can minimize the scale dependence of flow-routing methods using the maps in Figure 7 as input to a correction step. In this approach, a flow-routing algorithm (e.g., MFD and \( D_\infty \)) is first applied to the landscape to compute contributing area. Then, the flow-routing method is applied to the same landscape bilinearly interpolated to have a pixel width equal to one-half of the original grid, as in the analysis presented in Figures 7(c) and 7(d). The contributing area computed from the interpolated grid is then sub-sampled to the same resolution as the original grid, adopting the maximum value for contributing area within the 2 pixel \( \times \) 2 pixel subdomains of the interpolated DEM that represent each pixel in the original DEM. The maximum value within each sub-domain is chosen because the goal is to quantify the fluvial erosion rate of the dominant fluvial pathway within each pixel. The ratio of these two contributing area maps is then computed and denoted as \( f \). The unit contributing area, \( a \), is...
then calculated as
\[ a = \frac{A}{u_{hi}} \quad \text{if} \quad f \geq 1.2 \]
\[ a = \frac{A}{u_{vi}} \quad \text{if} \quad f < 1.2 \]
[32]
where \( u_{hi} \) is the flow width on hillslopes (i.e., \( u_{hi} = \delta \) if flow occurs as sheetflood and \( u_{hi} = \left(w_h/\iota_h\delta \right) \) if flow occurs in parallel rills) and \( u_{vi} \) is given by Equation [31]. This approach exploits the fact that the values of \( f \) differ on hillslopes (i.e., varying from approximately 1.2 to 2.0 depending on the degree of convergence) and in valleys (i.e., nearly equal to 1) in order to normalize the contributing area by the appropriate value of the width of the flow in each type of pixel (hillslope or valley). Results obtained with the synthetic landscape of Figure 7(b) suggest that a cutoff value of 1.2 works best for distinguishing between hillslope and valley pixels, that is, if the cutoff value is set significantly lower than 1.2, portions of first-order valleys are misidentified as hillslopes, whereas if the value is set significantly higher than 1.2, portions of convergent hillslopes are misidentified as valleys.

To combine hillslope diffusion and fluvial erosion within a framework in which \( z \) represents the elevation of the dominant fluvial pathway within each pixel, it is also necessary to scale the rate of erosion/deposition from hillslope processes by the ratio \( \delta/w \) for models with grids sufficiently coarse that channels are not explicitly resolved in cross section (as assumed here). On hillslopes with unconfined flow, the ratio \( \delta/w \) is 1; hence, the rate of erosion or deposition by hillslope processes is unaffected by this scaling. In valleys, however, the rate of deposition that occurs in the dominant fluvial pathway within each pixel is systematically underpredicted because the fluvial pathway is not resolved in cross section. The cross-sectional curvature is equal to the difference in the gradient of the side slopes adjacent to the dominant fluvial pathway divided by the width of that pathway. In a grid, in which the flow width is narrower than the pixel width, the curvature will, therefore, be underestimated by a factor of \( \delta/w \), assuming that the gradients of the side slopes are adequately resolved. As such, it is necessary to scale the curvature values by \( \delta/w \) to predict the correct deposition rate within the dominant fluvial pathway of each pixel. Integrating colluvial processes in this way into Equation [30] gives
\[
\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_s} U + \frac{\delta}{w} \kappa \nabla^2 z - K (a^0 S^{n_0} - \theta_{cd}) \quad \text{if} \quad a^0 S^{n_0} > \theta_{cd}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_s} U + \frac{\delta}{w} \kappa \nabla^2 z \quad \text{if} \quad a^0 S^{n_0} \leq \theta_{cd}
\]
[33]
for the DL model, where \( a = A/w \), and, for TL model,
\[
\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_s} U + \frac{\delta}{w} \kappa \nabla^2 z - \nabla \cdot q
\]
[34]
\[
q = k (a^0 S^{n_0} - \theta_{ct}) s \quad \text{if} \quad a^0 S^{n_0} > \theta_{ct}
\]
\[
q = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad a^0 S^{n_0} \leq \theta_{ct}
\]
[35]
The models illustrated in Figures 8 and 9 solve Equation [33] for the DL model and Equations [34] and [35] for the TL model, assuming a gently sloping (1%) initial landscape. Observed slope–area relationships in channels (e.g., \( S \propto A^{-b} \) with \( b \) in the range of 0.35–0.6) imply that \( \rho_d/\rho_s \) is in the range of approximately 0.7–1.2 and \( p_0/n_0 \) is in the range of approximately 1.7–2.2, assuming \( \rho_s/\rho_s \propto A^{1/2} \). Channel gradients are generally observed to be a power-law function of drainage area with an exponent between \(-0.35 \) and \(-0.6 \) for both DL and TL conditions (e.g., Hack, 1957; Tarboton et al., 1992; Iliass-Vasquez and Bras, 1995; Whipple and Tucker, 1999). This implies values for \( m/n \) of between approximately 0.35 and 0.6 if DL conditions and steady state are assumed, that is, \( m_d = 0.35 – 0.6 \) or \( p_d = 0.7 – 1.2 \) if \( n_d = 1 \). For steady state to be achieved in the TL model, the unit sediment flux must be proportional to the unit contributing area, implying for \( 1/2(p - 1)/n \) of approximately between 0.35 and 0.6 (Tarboton et al., 1992; Istanbulbuglu et al., 2003), that is, \( p_c = 1.7 – 2.2 \) if \( n_c = 1 \). The fluvial/slope-wash erosion component of each model is solved for at each time step of the model by calculating \( S \) in the downslope direction using a time step that satisfies the Courant stability criterion. The diffusive component of each model is calculated using the ADI technique.

In topographic steady state, landscapes produced with the DL and TL models are qualitatively quite similar, as landscape evolution models produced with DL and TL models over
the past 20 years have illustrated. Indeed, the similarity in landscape form predicted by these two end-member model types is one reason that both types have been applied to broad geomorphic questions (e.g., controls on drainage density) despite the lack of a firm basis for applying one or the other model type. Figures 8(a) and 9(a) illustrate landscapes driven to an approximate steady-state condition with the DL and TL models, respectively. Figure 8(a) was produced from a DL model using $p_d = 1$, $(\rho_d/\rho_i)U = 0.1$ m kyr$^{-1}$, $\kappa = 1$ m$^2$ kyr$^{-1}$, $K = 0.0005$ m$^{-1}$ kyr$^{-1}$, $c = 0.01$, and $\theta_c = 1$ m, rilled hillslopes with $w_h = 0.1\delta$, and a model domain of 250 m × 750 m. (a), (c), and (d) illustrate topography/elevation, (b) illustrates topographic curvature.
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Numerical modeling has become an integral component of the study of landscape evolution. This chapter described the principal techniques used to solve some of the most common diffusive and advective partial differential equations that arise in landscape evolution modeling, with a particular emphasis on landforms dominated by hillslope and fluvial processes. Transport-limited and DL models provide type examples of diffusive and advective equations, respectively. Transport-limited models are applicable to hillslope and fluvial systems dominated by colluvial and/or bed-load transport. DL models are applicable to landscapes dominated by suspended-load transport. The chapter also described some steps that are useful for minimizing the grid-resolution dependence of models when multiple process models are combined and channels are not fully resolved in cross section.

2.3.3 Conclusions
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